

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks. Claims 1-7 and 9-26 are pending. In the Office action dated August 20, 2003, claims 1-11 were rejected. Applicants have canceled claim 8 without prejudice and added claims 12-26.

I. The rejections in view of Rahrer should be withdrawn.

In the Office action, claims 1-11 were rejected as being unpatentable in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,005,927 to Rahrer et al. ["Rahrer"]. Applicants respectfully disagree.

A. Rahrer

With the goal of reaching a shared understanding of the disclosure of Rahrer, Applicants make the following observations.

Rahrer describes systems for maintaining and updating telephone directories. [Rahrer, Abstract.] Rahrer describes using calling line identification ["CLID"] information in various ways, including display of a caller's name and telephone number on a LCD display 36, and to maintaining and updating the telephone directories. [Rahrer, 6:1-16, 6:30-38, 9:18-10:14.] The CLID information is received by a CLID receiver 30 from a central office node of the network using one of several different mechanisms that depend on the particular service (e.g., CLASS, SMS) offered by a provider or subscribed to by the CLID receiver 30. [Rahrer, 6:1-16, 18:18-36.]

B. Claims 1-11

Claim 1 recites:

a receiving point for receiving information about a call originating from a first device;

a computer processor in communication with the receiving point for determining whether the received information is in a format recognizable for correct display by a second device, wherein the determining is based at least in part on consideration of display characteristics of the second device; and

an algorithm engine in communication with the computer processor for selectively adjusting the received information based at least in part on the display characteristics of the second device

Claim 6 recites:

receiving information and determining whether the information is in a format recognizable for correct display by the second device, wherein the information comprises a phone number associated with the first device, and wherein the determining is based at least in part on consideration of display characteristics of the second device;

Rahrer does not teach or suggest the above-cited language of claims 1 and 6, respectively. According to Rahrer, CLID information is communicated automatically from a network node (e.g., central office) to a given CLID receiver 30 using a mechanism established between the network and the CLID receiver. [Rahrer, 6:1-16, 8:18-36.] The transfer of CLID information in Rahrer does not involve consideration of the display characteristics of the device that will display the CLID information. In general, Rahrer is about automated updating of directories, not about adjusting or formatting information for correct display. Rahrer does not teach or suggest determining whether information is in a format recognizable for correct display by a device based at least in part on consideration of the display characteristics of the device (as recited in claims 1 and 6, respectively).

Claims 1 and 6 (and dependent claims 2-5, 7, and 9-11) should be allowable. In view of the foregoing discussion of claims 1 and 6, Applicants will not belabor the merits of the separate patentability of claims 2-5, 7, and 9-11.

II. The rejections in view of Levac should be withdrawn.

In the Office action, claims 1-4, 6, and 7 were alternatively rejected as being unpatentable in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,872,926 to Levac et al. ["Levac"]. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Examiner does not apply Levac to claims 5 and 8-11. Applicants have added certain language from claim 8 to claim 6.

A. Levac

With the goal of reaching a shared understanding of the disclosure of Levac, Applicants make the following observations.

Levac describes a messaging system that receives a message and converts the message to a format appropriate for communicating with a selected communication device. [Levac,

Abstract.] Levac does not address handling of calling name or phone number information. More generally, Levac addresses conversion of the content of a message itself, not conversion of information about the message.

B. Claims 1-4, 6, and 7

Claim 1 recites:

a receiving point for receiving information about a call originating from a first device;

a computer processor in communication with the receiving point for determining whether the received information is in a format recognizable for correct display by a second device, wherein the determining is based at least in part on consideration of display characteristics of the second device; and

an algorithm engine in communication with the computer processor for selectively adjusting the received information based at least in part on the display characteristics of the second device

Claim 6 recites:

receiving information and determining whether the information is in a format recognizable for correct display by the second device, wherein the information comprises a phone number associated with the first device, and wherein the determining is based at least in part on consideration of display characteristics of the second device;

Levac does not teach or suggest the above-cited language of claims 1 and 6, respectively. According to Levac, a message is converted to a format for communicating to a selected communication device. This involves conversion of the message itself, as opposed to conversion of information *about* the message. Levac does not teach or suggest the above-cited language of claim 1 regarding operations involving “information *about a call* originating from a first device.” Levac is even further from teaching or suggesting the above-cited language of claim 6 regarding operations where “the information comprises a phone number associated with the first device.”

Claims 1 and 6 (and dependent claims 2-4 and 7) should be allowable. In view of the foregoing discussion of claims 1 and 6, Applicants will not belabor the merits of the separate patentability of claims 2-4 and 7.

III. Miscellaneous


Applicants submitted formal drawings on May 10, 2001, but the Office action does not address the formal drawings. Please indicate whether the formal drawings are acceptable.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-7 and 9-26 should be allowable. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP

By 
Kyle B. Rinehart
Registration No. 47,027

One World Trade Center, Suite 1600
121 S.W. Salmon Street
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: (503) 226-7391
Facsimile: (503) 228-9446